

Appl. No. 09/714,785
Amdt. dated June 27, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 9, 2003

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-31 were pending in this application. Claims 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9, 16, 18, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41). Claims 2, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of Takasaki et al. (Japanese Patent JP403129990A Only English Abstract). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of Herz (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,883). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of McAbian (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,261). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of Kanevsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,334,109). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of Motomiya et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,783). Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of Coffin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,429). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of Coffin et al. and further in view of Bellegarda (U.S. Patent No. 5,502,774). Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of Coffin et al. and further in view of Pare Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,789). Claims 26 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of Hobbs (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,454). Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise in view of Hobbs and further in view of Klein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,000). Claim 28 was objected to for informalities. An affirmation of the election of claims for prosecution was also requested.

Applicant has amended claims 1-19 and 24, canceled claims 20-23 and 25-31 without prejudice, and added new claims 32-38. The specification has been amended

Appl. No. 09/714,785
Amdt. dated June 27, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 9, 2003

PATENT

to correct a typographical error. Applicant submits that no new subject matter has been added by this amendment. Claims 1-19, 24, and 32-38 remain pending in this application after entry of this amendment.

THE CLAIMS

Election/Restriction

Applicants affirm the election of claims 1-19 and 24-30 (Group I) for further prosecution in this application. Claims 20-23 (Group II) and claim 31 (Group III) have accordingly been canceled without prejudice. Applicants retain the right to present claims 20-23 and claim 31 in divisional applications.

Claim Objections

The objection is rendered moot as claim 28 has been canceled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

These rejections are rendered moot as claims 27-30 have been canceled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1

Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Kamise.

In addition to other features, claim 1, as amended recites:

wherein said processor is configured to determine additional information about said visitor based upon said information about said visitor gathered from said at least one input device and said at least one sensor; wherein said processor is configured to communicate a portion of the information about said visitor gathered from said at least one input device and said at least one sensor and a portion of said additional information to a user; (Applicants' claim 1, as amended, emphasis added)

Accordingly, as recited in claim 1, information about the visitor is gathered from the one or more input devices and the one or more sensors. Additionally, the gathered information is then used to determine additional information about the user.

Appl. No. 09/714,785
Amdt. dated June 27, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 9, 2003

PATENT

Examples of the "additional information" may include information about the visitor's previous visit, personal information about the visitor, topics of interest to the visitor, weather in the town that the visitor came from, weather during the visitor's previous visit, results of the visitor's home sports teams, cultural events in the visitor's home town, security related information, information about the visitor's licenses, DMV information about the visitor, property ownership information of the visitor, visitor's criminal information, etc. (See Specification; pages 13-14). As recited in claim 1, portions of the additional information and the information gathered about the visitor are then communicated to a user.

Applicants submit that at least the features recited in claim 1 and described above are not anticipated by Kamise. Kamise describes an unmanned reception system that comprises a camera configured to take an image of the visitor, means for scanning a business card, a card dispenser for dispensing a card that the visitor can use at an entry gate, and means that allow a visitor to select a visit destination. Kamise teaches that the business card information, the visitor's image, and the visit destination information may be stored in a database ("visitor database"). However, Kamise does not use the information gathered about the user (e.g., business card information, visitor's image, etc.) to determine additional information about the visitor. As understood, there is nothing in Kamise that teaches or suggests this additional feature of determining additional information about the visitor based upon information gathered about the user from the one or more input devices and the sensors, as recited in claim 1. Since Kamise does not teach determining the "additional information", the feature of communicating a portion of the additional information (in addition to communicating a portion of information gathered from the one or more input devices) to a user is also not taught by Kamise.

Applicants thus submit that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Kamise for at least the reasons stated above, and others.

Appl. No. 09/714,785
Amdt. dated June 27, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 9, 2003

PATENT

Claims 4, 6-7, 9, 16, 18, 24-25

Applicants submit that independent claims 16 and 24, as amended, are not anticipated by Kamise for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 1, and others.

Applicants further submit that claims 4, 6, 7, and 9 which depend from claim 1 are not anticipated by Kamise for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 1, and others. Claim 18, which depends from claim 16, is not anticipated by Kamise for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 16, and others.

Claim 25 has been canceled without prejudice.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As discussed above, at least the features of

wherein said processor is configured to determine additional information about said visitor based upon said information about said visitor gathered from said at least one input device and said at least one sensor; wherein said processor is configured to communicate a portion of the information about said visitor gathered from said at least one input device and said at least one sensor and a portion of said additional information to a user; (Applicants' claim 1, as amended)

recited in claim 1, as amended, are not taught or suggested by Kamise. Applicants further submit that these features are also not taught or suggested by Takasaki et al., Herz, McAbian, Kanevsky et al., Motomiya et al., Coffin et al., Bellegarda, Pare Jr. et al., Hobbs, and Klein et al.

As understood, none of the cited references mentioned above teach or suggest the features of claim 1 recited above. Accordingly, even if the cited references were combined, and there is no clear indication to do so, the combination would fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 1 described above.

Applicants thus submit that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated or made obvious by the above-mentioned cited references, considered individually or in combination. Applicants thus submit that claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/714,785
Amdt. dated June 27, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 9, 2003

PATENT

Applicants further submit that independent claims 16 and 24 are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 1, and others. Applicants further submit that claims 2-15 and new claims 32-34 which depend from claim 1, and claims 17-19 which depend from claim 16, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claims 1 and 16, and others.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 32-38 to claim aspects of the present invention. Applicants submit that the new claims are in a condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/714,785
Amdt. dated June 27, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 9, 2003

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

S. B. Kotwal

Sujit B. Kotwal
Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SBK:km
PA 3309641 v1